

**PATENT COOPERATION TREATY**

From the  
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

Bruess, Steven C.  
MERCHANT & GOULD PC  
P.O.Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
ETATS-UNIS D'AMERIQUE

PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION**  
(PCT Rule 66)

*ATY RESP W.O. : July 13, 2004*

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	13.04.2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference 758.1491WOU1 ✓		REPLY DUE	within 3 month(s) from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/US 03/02799	International filing date (day/month/year) 31.01.2003	Priority date (day/month/year) 10.07.2002	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC B01D46/52			
Applicant DONALDSON COMPANY, INC.			

1. This written opinion is the **first** drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I  Basis of the opinion
- II  Priority
- III  Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV  Lack of unity of invention
- V  Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI  Certain documents cited
- VII  Certain defects in the international application
- VIII  Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also: For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis. For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 10.11.2004

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:   European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016	Authorized Officer  Willsher, C  Formalities officer (incl. extension of time limits) Delmon, G Telephone No. +31 70 340-2525
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



**I. Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (*Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed"*):

**Description, Pages**

1-43 as originally filed

**Claims, Numbers**

1-18 as originally filed

**Drawings, Sheets**

1/34-34/34 as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language**, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

- the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

- contained in the international application in written form.
- filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- the description, pages:
- the claims, Nos.:
- the drawings, sheets:

5.  This opinion has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

**V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement****1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Claims	1-18(yes)
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	1-18(no)
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-18(yes)

**2. Citations and explanations****see separate sheet**

**WRITTEN OPINION**  
**SEPARATE SHEET**

International application No. PCT/US03/02799

1. The closest prior art (JP-A-1 171 615, Document D1) describes a corrugated filter element in which the crests and valleys are folded against an adjacent flat sheet to effect a closure. This differs from the present claims, where closure is effected by folding the corrugation against itself, and not against the adjacent flat sheet. Presently claimed subject-matter is therefore novel.
2. It is not evident from the application documents what technical advantage or unforeseen effect results from the present folding. No inventive step can be recognised at the moment. The applicant is requested to explain any advantages, and why they would not be expected from D1.
3. Claims 1-18 do not fulfill the requirement of Article 33(3) PCT.